From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXA	AMINING AUTHORIT	Y	PCT		
То:					
1	EGANGEN us & Partner Juli 2004	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	WRITTEN OPINIC)N	
		Date of mailing (day month year)	19/07/2004		
Applicant's or agent's file reference G 2536 PCT		REPLY DUE	EPLY DUE within $1 / 00$ months/days from the above date of mailing		
International application No.	International filing date	(day month year)	Priority date (day/mo	onth/year)	
PCT/EP03/12664	12/11/2003		13/11/2002		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC					
Application	G01N33/542				
Applicant MICROMET AG et al.					
1. This written opinion is the first drawn of the contains indications relating to the opinion of the opinion opinion of the opinion opin	Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regardsupporting such statements to this opinion. The application to this opinion. The applicant may, le 66.2(d). The applicant may, le 66.2(d). The amendments, see to submit amendments, see to submit amendments,	rd to novelty, inventive to novelty, inventive to novelty, inventive to the expiration of the control of the co	ndustrial applicability e step or industrial appl of that time limit, reque ents, according to Rule	st this Authority	
For the examiner's obligation For an informal communicati If no reply is filed, the international pro-	on with the examiner, see	Rule 66.6.	on the basis of this opi		
4. The final date by which the internationa examination report must be established		13/03	/2005	a sisches Patentami.	
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer		A CHILOPHON	
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx: 52365 Fax: (+49-89) 2399-4465	·	Examiner Formalities officer (incl. extension of tim Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2	878 8		
Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2	2002)			Sado Vue e Office europée	

- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.